

BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Minutes of November 20, 2012 Meeting

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, November 20, 2012.

Present: Ed Horne, John Taylor, Hal Hester, Jon Morris, Elliot Mann, Bernice Cutler, Travis Haston, Harry Sherrill and Zeke Acosta

Absent: Jon Wood, Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva, and Tim West

1. MINUTES APPROVED

The motion by Elliot Mann, seconded by Ed Horne, to approve the October 27, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.

2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Bernice Cutler thanked Willis Horton, Jeff Griffin and all the folks that helped the Apartment Association with a couple of issues last month.

Jon Morris thanked the department, Gene, Patrick and the team. One of their customers had several issues with racking permits; once issues was expressed in the middle of a project; they stepped up and answered it very well and set up a brown bag luncheon with 2 sessions; 80 seats filled for the first session and the 2nd session is filled as well.

Jon Morris introduced Chris Daly from Childress Klein; saying he is attending today to observe.

Hal Hester thanked the department, Willis and staff for promoting professionalism.

3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES

Joe Padilla shared the issue of change with fire separation requirements on residential and it came to attention this week that the NCHBA submitted a request to amend that particular portion of the code. When the code was adopted back in March it took it back from 3' to 5' side yard separation. That amendment will be coming for public hearing on September 4th, 2012. The public hearing will be in Raleigh at 9:00 a.m. This has a big impact especially here where there are 100s of lots with 5' separation now and if that issue is not changed you are going to have plans that need to be redesigned for fire rated walls throughout the county and possibly across the state.

JB: The Building Code Council's regular meeting is on December 10th and they will start the day with the public hearing on part C of their agenda at 9:00 a.m. It's at McKennon Center on the campus of NC State University.

4. AUTO-NOTIFICATION PROGRAM REVISIONS

Jeff Griffin gave a presentation on the Auto-Notification program revisions. Jeff went on to say they have had several meetings with industry. The presentation is tailored to take to different groups to talk about the program, some of the features with the program and some of the issues with the program. Some of the issues is that current staff is performing about 800 – 1000 inspections per day. It is a daunting task to meet everyone's expectations so what we are trying to do is put tools in place that will work for us all. To be effective, staff needs to be performing inspections; if they are stationary there is lost productivity. The staff we have can spend an hour or more per day just calling people back/touching base on when they are going to be on site. The goal is that we are trying to be as productive as we can with our time and out staff. We looked at several areas where we modified the auto-notification program. We have a customer dashboard and an inspector's dashboard; where you go to the sign-in screen on the web, your account, your information is about how they communicate effectively with each other. Looking at some of the features we want to enhance; key points would be 1) the ability to add contacts (multiple contacts) at the account level, the permit level or the inspection request level, 2) the text message has changed, 3) the alert event is recorded, 4) special homeowner access issues. The expectations is when I arrive at a job site look at my list and select the button for my next inspection "alert" that gives you heads up that you are next in the cycle. To simplify this we have produced a news release that walks you through the 3 processes of how to get set up along with screenshots telling you where to go in order to sign-up at these multiple new levels; what are the new things that have been added to your dashboard.

JM: Zeke, Ed, John Taylor, is this good, bad, indifferent?

EH: One question, it's good to know you are next in line; is there any other tool or would it be a major hassle for the customer to see another thing that says I am on my way? You know you're next in line but again it could be a 2 hr. inspection or a 15 min. inspection.

JB: that's one of the concerns the department had pursuing this change, the original promise to the program designed back in 2005 – 2006 that it was a 15 minute notice. That was the part that was negotiated with the industry; that's what everyone wanted. This change idea is approximately a one hour window and there isn't anything in between. It's going from a tightly defined window to something that's much bigger, with advantages to that but the disadvantage is that the window is bigger and knowing that you are going to connect with them is much looser.

JM: It was the industry that requested this?

JB: Originally came up with the criteria 15 minutes, all agreed; now what the industry has asked for is that be expanded to a 60 minute window in concept.

EH: Given the choice I'd much rather has a bigger window because you can better prepare for it.

EM: I think when the industry requested the initial one we didn't have anything at that time and now that has been in place for a longer period of time is where the evolution is.

TH: If you didn't have a guy on site; that 15 minute alert was useless.

JB: The original idea was not necessarily that you wanted to meet them on site but it was better than nothing. At that time there wasn't always the idea that you'd always want to meet them. At the time our travel times were about 8 minutes on the average; they would get to your site and would be on site for a certain period of time.

EH: Keep in mind this is a benefit to the department as well. We've got to have a ladder for the inspector to look at something and I can't get out there and have no access. There is a benefit of having everything ready for the inspection and the department.

TH: Are they being told to key in the alert; instead of being 1 job away; it's the 2nd?

JG: We are having a staff meeting showing them that they need to key the alert when they arrive up to your next inspection. Typically we are talking an average of 70-75 percent of folks will receive those within 45 minutes to 1 hour and 15 minutes.

TH: But they are probably doing it before they get out of the truck to go to the current inspection for the next inspection.

JG: That's the policy.

GM: We've also told them on the large jobs; when we have some that will last 3 – 4 hours, being outside the box of what we created the program for, so try to come back in, get to a place where you can do this in a more timely fashion. We will have to make adjustments for some inspections.

JM: How many inspections do you feel like it gives you a day more?

JG: What it doesn't give us is more inspections per day; it gives the customer the tool they want. What happens now they call and say they'd like to get a 30 minute call prior to but the inspector doesn't see that until he goes to the job site and pulls up the note that says call me 30 minutes in advance?

GM: In response to your question how much more time does it save us; I think it continues to help us avoid long phone conversations; we may not gain that much more but it gives the customer better notice and helps us.

EM: I think when we put this into effect in 2005-2006 it was shown that when the builder was on site with the inspector failure rates were usually significantly lower and miscommunication was down and this makes it more efficient.

GM: One of the primary reasons we developed it originally was to give you the opportunity to get on site and understand any failures and give you a chance to ask questions about the remaining ones.

TH: Do you think we'll actually run into a problem with contractors trying to use the H1 as free inspection by appointment? Are they going to be told to call the contractors if they are the contact on the H1/or if they pick up on it?

JG: Yes, the way the priority inspection guideline reads it actually is a requirement that they call that homeowner. So you'll get alerted that we're about to go to that job site but we'll reach out and make that contact.

GM: If they abuse the advantages of the H1 or H2?

TH: I have some customers that would make sure that I am with the inspector when he comes to the house and so I would automatically not want them involved and take care of it for them but it's still that same situation, correct; whereas there might be another situation where a contractor had put his information down and expected to be called an hour ahead of time so he knows exactly what time and treat it as an inspection by appointment.

JG: If the contractor wants to be there it might be that we do an H1 or H2, it might be that we give the contractor lead time to get to the site. What we encourage in the new language for the contractor is to be there and available.

EM: When you go and get a new permit is there a place to assign who gets the auto-notification or do you have to go back in later as permits are added?

JG: Yes, it's driven on your side, your dashboard.

TH: You could take all the subs off and then each permit you can specify who you want.

JM: I think it's a great example of you communicating and listening to your customer; that's all we can ask; thank you.

5. BETTERMENT PROPOSALS

Overview of Proposals

Jim Bartl discussed the betterment proposals posed to the BDC today and move on to the BOCC December 5th. JB sent a summary memo with supporting documentation last Thursday, the goal here is to briefly review the high points, and give the discussion floor to you folks as quickly as we can and conclude with a formal vote from the BDC on the two betterment proposals. Handout: two RFBA's going to the board. The data sheet shows that our permit counts are up 7 – 12% depending on what your base of reference is in the last 4 months and inspection counts are up 15-20% and we are also beginning to get more large projects in the office and they are consuming more of our review time which is a concern to us as well. Permit revenue is very healthy after four months; we'll talk more about this later in the meeting that the permit revenue is above projection by about 1.2MM. Other revenue is also above projection by over \$150K and total revenue is about 1.35MM above projection. There are two betterment packages. Betterment Package #1 is 17 positions with a cost in FY13 of \$912,235 which matches the number that is in front of the RFBA in your handouts. That includes in the office; 3 commercial plans examiners; 2 inspector II controller positions; 1 project coordinator/plan review facilitator. In the field the addition on the initial package #1 is 9 inspector II's and 2 inspection supervisors; package also includes recognizing revenue to cover \$128,280 in expenses that we missed in the FY13 budget process; that relates to bankcard fees, revenue collection support and contract labor supporting existing technology enhancement. This is package #1. Betterment Package #2 is another four inspector positions those are going to be IBA focused, they have a cost of \$263,265 in FY13. We will end with a formal vote, a separate one on the first and second packages and then we want some feedback from you on the reclass proposal that Patrick Granson will briefly discuss.

Office Betterment Proposal

Patrick Granson gave an overview of the office betterment proposal, saying it is based on our OnSchedule and Mega performance we have been tracking since FY12 to current FY13 we are looking at comparisons. In FY12 we were looking at 890 work hour. Currently FY13 total hours used so far is 1707. We use hours, we don't use trips; we look at time in the product in terms of the reviews. Our hours have almost doubled so that tells us we are seeing a lot more large projects; we are pushing a lot more projects in larger volume in that area and it's taking a lot more of the reviewer's time; with that being said; we think this justifies the four plans examiners as well as the plans facilitator/coordinator is a

position that supports those four plans examiners for the admin side. The CTAC side which is the in scope review averaged about 480 permits with a total of 1943. For FY13 currently we are at 2457; meaning we are seeing 2457 total for that month which is a 26% increase of people using in scope review. What this means is that we have to take somebody off line to deal with direct permit submissions so we can filter those and do the research to verify what is going on. We are seeing a wide jump in the e-scope review which is what we want; we want the interactive process through the internet to work. The electronic plan review process; CTAC will be moving forward with that. As you know EPS/EPR for OnSchedule was complete January 27th. Tim's group will be moving forward with that in December. We did have our soft roll out and are working out some bugs. We will see this taking more of the reviewer's time to do. The project coordinator supports the plans examiners. In Chart B it shows the controllers; we had a pilot program we ran for 90 days to justify the packing and the bundling of electronic drawings. In that pilot program we saw that AAN, Interactive Review and Approved Projects dropped. Also in the customer relationship base we noticed that when we provided these two positions we had to build these relationships by working with the customers and answering these questions immediately. We think these two positions are justified as inspector III's to help bridge the gap for training as a customer relationship piece, an education piece and for maintaining the minimum submittal guidelines that we have in the plan review process.

Office Sr. Plans Examiner Re-Class Proposal

The office senior plans examiner is a re-class; we have that position available; we had it back in the first RIF but we had to give it up. We would like to bring that position back noticing that the management team project managers that we have; Melanie, Chuck, Tim are struggling meeting customer service needs and staffing needs. We are trying to balance those and want our manager's deal with customer service issues, someone to work through the interactive review problems, the approved as noted and any code interpretations they may have. This senior plans examiner will plug back in and take some of those problems off of the project manager so the project managers can work the customer service issues. There are a total of six betterments and one re-class.

EM: We are tracking the hours of work here and you mentioned that we are on a learning curve with the E-Plan review; how much of an increase in hourly load is just due to inefficiency and learning curve?

PG: I can't speak directly to E-Plan, Tim can but I know that on the OnSchedule side and the Mega side if we did not have the controllers there we would have another increase of 25% of time dealing with the customer and disapprovals.

EM: Approval w/out the interaction side, just approving plans on E-Plan now vs. approving them the way we used to do them.

PG: You are talking about E-Plan and I don't have that data for E-Plan; this is about OnSchedule, Mega and CTAC; E-Plan works in a different environment in terms of the computer system. It works in a "yes/no" type program.

JB: Are you talking about learning curve in terms of the plan reviewers doing their work?

EM: Yes, plan reviewers because that's what you are tracking is how many hours we're doing things today and if we're not fully efficient at it would obviously add more hours; when we get more efficient I would assume that would reduce.

JB: There is some built in inefficiency. Every pilot that was done across the country on electronic plan submittal found that you can actually review stuff in paper faster than you can electronically in 2-D. This doesn't take into account the fact that you get rid of all the paper but in terms of doing the review if you can conceive of; if you want to page on something electronically, you can probably page faster on paper than you can electronically even though we load them on two screens. That's not going away. We hope that the efficiency on the customer's side in preparing their packages interacting with us that's where we'd pick up a lot and save us time and there is a learning curve there. Not trying to say that the inefficiency on staff's use of the tool is mammoth but there is a difference. We didn't do this to save time

in the review process. We think as projects go to Building Information Modeling (BIM) there will be a big savings of time because then you can page faster inside the model than you can electronically in 2-D.

Field Inspections Betterment Proposal #1

Gene Morton talked about two field proposals. The first proposal is to add 9 inspectors as Jim indicated we sent all of you a lot more information than I'm going to cover as I will be doing an overview of the information that we sent you. The numbers that relate to inspection requests; we have 4 months of this year and we can compare that in different ways to last year's numbers to give us a trend. One way is to look at the lows and annualize the first 4 months of this year and compare to last year, which is one way we've done it. If we do that, annualizing the first 4 months of FY13 and compare them to FY12 we actually see a 20% increase in inspection requests. There are other ways to do it ranging from 15 – 20 % depending on how you do the math. The current North and South team inspector count is 64 positions and if you apply that 20% that equates to 13 positions needed; we are asking for 9 being a bit conservative. The types of positions we want to add based on the workload indicates 2 building, 2 electrical, 2 mechanical/plumbing and 3 multi-trade positions. Permit counts as Patrick's numbers indicate are still increasing and that in itself will result in an increased inspection load and with the increase in workload we are already experiencing we are already beginning to see the response time suffer. Other factors are review processes are sometimes slow due to some of the new technologies and we have some that are affecting the field. There are different factors; one is the increase complexity in our job. We're looking at things we never looked at before and everything that is added to the codes; we are required to perform inspections to ensure compliance of the codes; all this just adds more time the inspector needs to spend on the job (will slow him down a bit). Changes in technology like learning curves in new hardware, iPads, iPhones; getting used to using electronic plans. All these factors will slow us down and require us to do more training to get our staff up to speed. Some of it is a learning curve but as Jim said some of it will be a bit slower for us. It's going to be better in some ways and a little worse in others. The increase demands for inspection and inspectors in pre-construction activities; we're getting more and more involved in processes of the project that aren't necessarily related to just inspection of the work. We're involved in some of the team effort to head off problems, to look ahead and solve problems before they occur and slow the project. Another problem we are seeing is the increase in stakeholder expectations and part of that is due to the time when we are over staffed we were able to double-back, handhold, explain the code to customers that don't understand the code and that takes time. The increase in Auto-Notification Program, the improvements that we're doing is just going to give more customers more opportunity to ask questions and in most cases that help us in solving problems in the end but for some of our customers seems it doesn't matter how much you try to help them up front; they are still going to make small mistakes whether you are trying to help them or not. Team managers and supervisors seem to be more involved in helping customers get out of the predicaments that they get into either from poor planning or from not understanding some of the requirements for project building. Project delivery strategy changes will also cause us to spend more time with customers. When someone decides they're going to occupy a portion of the buildings maybe up front they assured us that they would not want to occupy any of the building until they complete the whole project. All those things take more time for us to deliver the service and perform the inspections. Last but not least are the special projects that seem to get identified by the City or the County Manager that asks us to treat things with care, add some assistance when necessary; all those add time for inspections on projects. Primarily the workload in itself seems to indicate that we need to add staff and at the same time were considering all of the other influences that we have to deal with on a daily basis. Seems like now more than ever, we are involved with other activities that we weren't before.

EM: Why are we doing two proposals?

JB: It was my choice. I didn't want one proposal to take the whole package down, we need the 17 really badly and the 7; we think it makes sense, weren't certain so we split them up. The other thing is that there

are 2 identifiably different issues. The one is workload and the second one is efficiency out of two different revenue sources so it just struck me as they should fly separate.

Field Inspections Betterment Proposal #2

This proposal is to add 4 inspector positions that are Inspection By Appointment (IBA) focus. The IBA program is a premium service program which was initiated back in 2007 before the recession and is similar to/field equivalent to express review in plan review; it allows customers to schedule time sensitive inspection with an inspector to remain on the project for that block of time. What this does is allows the identifying defects to be corrected during the inspection resulting in a higher pass rate for the customer/project. The big benefit is that it saves the customer/owner valuable time and expense. In 2008 the IBA positions were mainstreamed into the regular territorial workforce to ensure that inspector's time was used effectively. During the RIFs the positions that were added as the start of the program were cut but because of the continued interest in the program; the program itself remains in place. So we lost some positions that were added specifically for the program. Current interest for IBA is running so high that the IBAs often compete with other regular customer service at the signs of the inspections at large. To solve this we're proposing to add 4 inspector III positions that are IBA focused which will take care of the IBA service demands first before turning to the overall inspections load. This proposal will stop the problem of IBAs competing for time with other customer inspection requests and revenue generated by the IBA will off-set the added cost.

TH: Do we have any current inspector that handle IBA full time or is it just mingled into everyone's daily workload depending on the area?

JB: When he said we mainstreamed it; that's when we went away from and that's what they did and everybody handles it now so you can see how it would compete with the other work.

TH: None specific?

GM: There are none that are dedicated just to the IBA Program.

EM: So we really made 4 people more efficient; we make the whole group more efficient and we have 4 people who are fully focusing on that.

GM: Partly because the demand was low at that time; inspectors would have been sitting around waiting for an IBA and they were filling in, doing vacation back-ups, and training back-ups. We found the best thing to do was to streamline them at that time but things has changed the interest in the program has just skyrocketed. We've seen it now seriously competing with the normal inspections.

JB: When IBA was conceived back in 2005 one of the concerns and reasons it was designed as a separate team was that it would compete with normal customer service and the way we solved that was to have them be a dedicated team that's what they did and you didn't have to worry about them competing. Even when there was a continuity critical inspection the regular inspector would do the work and the IBA inspector would pick up their normal load so there wasn't competition. When we mainstreamed it; we knew that was a risk but there was not a lot of heavy demand. As we've come out of the recession I think that combined with the fact that we're in a team based project focused delivery mechanism where there seems to be more demand on IBA because they get more information about how to settle those problems. It's taken off and we're getting into a lot of spots where it's competing and that's why I did these proposals as two different events. They are really 2 different issues; a service effectiveness issue where a tool, that's a great tool is starting to compete with our normal service and we didn't want that happening.

JM: Jim when we went through this last week and spent a couple of hours on it last week, the math to me shows we are talking about generating a surplus of revenue of \$4MM this year and these 17 inspectors would cost us \$1.5MM - \$2MM? To me, representing a commercial owner, we have a revenue surplus and you are talking about employing people and adding people to create more efficiency so that when I go hire Zeke to pull a permit; he gets it faster and I can deliver my customer/tenants their space quicker; it's a no brainer to me; it balances the budget and doesn't need a whole lot of explanation.

JB: On both sides the revenue works on this. We have the revenue on the regular permit fee structure now to fund the base 17 positions that we are proposing. The proposal for the added 4 positions actually reaches into a different pool which is our other revenue and we can track IBA revenue that's coming now. We restricted this during the DHC and if we hadn't restricted it during the DHC, it's on a pace where it would pay for these four positions so we think this pays for itself adding these positions.

TH: What is the percentage of the IBA during the day requests are vs. after hours; which would be equivalent to overtime right?

GM: There is two programs, there is an IBA program that is basically an 8-5 program and the OTI program is an afterhours program and they are tracked separately. I think what Jim is referring to is the IBA revenue alone is going to off-set the cost of these positions.

EH: It is a deal if you can get an inspection guaranteed at a certain time for \$230 and like you said if you have an inefficiency; they can correct it there. I agree with what Jon said I think it's a no-brainer on the 17 positions you are talking about here. I think in my opinion it's also a no-brainer on the IBAs too. Revenue is there and will be generated there when they are not working on IBA that can lessen the load a bit on the others; to me it makes perfect sense.

EM: Jim, how much did we end up with as surplus last year?

JB: About \$3.5MM, we had \$950+ out of FY11; we had about \$3.6 last year so we are sitting at about \$4.5 in the department's reserve fund.

EM: So we've got a shock absorber rebuild, and seeing the leading trend of things starting to grow, we want to maintain service levels, we've got the revenue to justify it and it seems to only make good sense to get those positions in place ahead of the curve.

EH: One more thing, I did a following of the electrical contractors and out of about 10 I talked to they were talking about noticing a bit more lag in inspection times and I think the need is obviously there.

EM: We're seeing it on the permitting side; we're seeing it coming in the door which is the leading edge to what they are going to be doing to inspections a few months down the road.

JB: Are there any further questions? Jon wanted some open time for discussion to be sure that you thought that we were focusing the resources where we need to in this betterment. Again; office-6 positions, 3 plan reviewers, 2 inspector III that Patrick has used as controllers, a project coordinator/plans review facilitator to support the added team. In the field-9 inspectors +2 inspections supervisors, one for the North one or the South teams and that is separate from the 2nd proposal which is 4 IBA focused inspectors. Comments? Are those resources going where you think they need to be? This is what we think the data says to us.

EM: In a lot of those positions are there licensing levels that can shift in reallocate with that knowledge based licensing level to other resources/areas if need be.

PG: We do that now. We move them from CTAC when CTAC work is heavy. It's just the tool that you have to use; you take the people and push your resources.

EM: So it's not like we are hiring them in limited roles where they are only good in that silo.

JB: The way that we are organized in teams now I think the manager's look at their resources beyond their teams. If Gary sees a resource on Jeff's team or he sees a resource inside plan review that he needs to use to solve a project problem, he'll say that. I think we are much more inclined today to pool all the resources and look at what resources we need to solve a project problem which is the nature of the reorganization that we did in 2010.

TH: If we're seeing an increase in permit issues vs. this time last year and dealing with the same amount of teams from the review side to the inspector side we don't want to catch ourselves in limbo in 3 months.

EM: Say, we vote today and say we approve, how long is it before you have breathing functioning bodies in these roles? How long will it be before they even make an impact?

JB: The peculiarity on 4 of the positions, the senior plans examiner is a reclass and can happen quickly as well as 3 of the others will happen quickly; the rest have to run through the normal HR process.

GM: If it was 2 years ago I could say it would probably be January, February could find someone that could hit the ground running at that time but we are not sure if we are going to be able to hire people that

are already certified and trained as inspectors so there will be a training period likely for those that we hire so it may get into closer to the early summer before they will be effective. They will obviously be able to help us at least by February/March I would guess with some having a more stringent training curve before they are fully effective.

PG: Some of the challenges you have to remember is when you bring someone new on; they come in and we have to retool them. Our technology and advancements completed needs to be bridged. It's effective and efficient but it takes time to regear them to what we do. In the efficiency side/ the customer service side, then there are policies and procedures; all the luggage we carry about history about who we are and what we are. Those are all key points.

GMullis: This action if the board here decides to move this forward, we still have to go to the commissioner's level, so it's going to be January before we can start the HR process.

JB: We should be able to start the HR process on December the 5th. It's schedule to be on the agenda for the BOCC on December 4th.

GMullis: It took me 4 weeks to go through HR to get 2 part-time positions.

EM: We need to keep our finger on the pulse because we could find ourselves behind the ball.

JB: That's the reason we brought it to you now.

JM: Do we just vote to enact these 2 RFBA's?

JB: If the BDC is comfortable that the resources that we are proposing serve the needs that you feel are out there then if we could handle them as 2 separate proposals; and the first is simply to ask the BDC to consider a formal motion supporting the department's betterment proposal package 1 for 17 positions as described in the RFBA with a total FY13 estimated cost of \$912,235.

BETTERMENT PROPOSAL PACKAGE #1

Travis Haston made a formal motion of approval supporting the department's Betterment Proposal Package #1 for 17 positions as described in the RFBA with a total FY13 estimated cost of \$912,235 with Ed Horne seconding the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

BETTERMENT PROPOSAL PACKAGE #2

Ed Horne made a formal motion of approval supporting the department's Betterment Proposal Package #2 for 4 inspector positions, IBA focused as described in the RFBA with a total FY13 estimated cost of \$263,265 with Travis Haston seconding the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

JB: Patrick talked about a senior plans examiner re-class and we want to make sure you have no concerns. What we are doing is taking a position which is currently plan review focused and re-classing it to work as a sr. plans examiner for the purposes that he described. Any concerns over that and do you think it makes sense? It's an efficiency thing that we had to throw overboard in the first RIF in 2009 and are now getting to the point we need to get it back to manage things. Seeing no concerns; we will move forward accordingly. Thank you very much. We appreciate the support on this.

JM: Thank you for the research; I think going forward I don't know that we need to map this out necessarily but think about what appropriate staffing levels are if we continue the current revenue level. At one point we were at 242 people moving all the way down under 150 and now we are going to add 21 positions back but at what may be an equilibrium level and hopefully if revenue continues at current levels there will be a choice between whether we continue to add staff and/or conceivably lower the permit rate which when we made all of these permit revenue changes by filling in the valleys and making sure we are more efficient and we weren't subsidizing certain permits at the expense of others; we talked about when we hit a normal level of permit activity we would go back and lower the overall rate. I would just like the meeting notes to show that we are considering that and maybe it's a Spring or Summer conversation but as we get later in the year we keep that in the front of our minds in addition to the betterments necessary to keep up with the customer service level.

EM: We've got to make sure we've got the customer service leveled first.

JB: You have just identified and described the balance between adding staff to maintain service and fee adjustments as described in previous meeting discussions that we've had with the BDC. You just outlined one of the big fee topics inside of the Budget Subcommittee's work going into FY14. There's obviously all the normal work we would do but I think there is also that topic which is going to be one that we study.

JP: Is this going to be a Public Hearing on the 4th and is there any help we can provide from the industry.

JB: No, it's just a vote. People can come speak but typically on something that has unanimous support by the BDC, a lot of times it goes through as a consent item; it's not even up for discussion. The only reason it would be discussed is if one of the commissioners chooses to pull it for some reason and they want it to be discussed in the public venue. Point noted Jon; we'll have something in the minutes about your comment.

JM: I think it is important that the priorities on customer service and then on lowering the permit fee rate but to consider both.

TH: Can we see the number of the inspector in the field; as technology increases are we lessening the need for numbers ahead or can we put our thumb on that yet, even in the office?

JB: Historically we've always been doing that. If you compare us to other authorities the story I tell that I think answers your question without going in to too great of details; I made a presentation in Chicago at an AIA convention in 2004 and next to me was the head of the department from LA, CA and at the time they had a double permit activity level as us, we had 75K per year; they had 140K per year, we were just under 200 employees; they had over 900 employees. They were operating back in the Stone Age; which is the level of difference. Now that's not just technology but most authorities still have their inspectors come into the office pick up paper loads, go into the field, do the inspections, bring the results in at the end of the day. If you surveyed the field of 225 authorities in the state of NC you will find that there are maybe a dozen that are sophisticated in their use of technology and a lot of them are not.

TH: When Jon mentioned about 6-7 yrs ago before the RIF, the amount of people we had where as now we are not behind that much in total revenue.

JM: The average back then was maybe \$1.8MM - \$2MM per month and now we're at \$1.3MM - \$1.4MM.

JB: Our budget is \$16.2MM before this betterment. Before the economy tanked we were at \$24.7MM so we're way off.

TH: And we had how many people?

JB: 242 people.

EM: Theoretically we've done a lot of technology betterments. We've got everything back to the exact same levels where we were before. You'd hope we'd need less people because of the economy.

6. Findings on Inspection Response Time (IRT) Report

Jim handed out supporting documentation and gave background on the findings of the IRT report. This topic deals with the Inspection Response Time report and another report we use in the office for management purposes called the Inspection Efficiency Report. The IRT report was developed by the Revere Group in 2004 and the purpose was to measure our 24 hour percent complete on inspections; aka Inspections Complete within the first day. IER was introduced in 2009 as a team based management report primarily developed for us to manage multi-trade inspection teams and our efficiency on that level. These look at the issue of how quickly we respond to inspections. The same information point but different information sets from a different perspective. We have always noticed there was a difference from when the IER came out of about 5%. The 5% is not atypical if you take our information sets and use different basis that you slightly tweak; you'll get 5% difference. There's always at least a 5% difference between the fee levels that are recognized inside the Posse report and the fee reports that we use from Navision that we report to you every month. When it first came out it wasn't a big deal. The reason we are discussing this with you now is that as we move through this spring and into the summer we started to notice a larger variance. You'll recall that when I discussed the IRT numbers from August

with you in the September, I expressed some puzzlement that they were as good as they were because in the teeth of getting ready for the DNC, one of the things we did was we sent an email out to tell customers that we were going to be hard pressed to maintain our IRT goals and that the likelihood is that a lot of them would get 2 and 3 day service just because of the problem we were wrestling with the DNC. What the August numbers showed you was that we actually performed better all month than we ever had and admittedly we had blocked out vacations, blocked out training but it looked fishy. So we started the third week in September we began to study it in detail through November 7th and came to three conclusions; 1) that there were a variance between the two reports that was significant, 2) the IRT report that we have been using since 2004 doesn't accurately reflect the field condition and a further problem is that as we studied this was that neither report really reflects the performance criteria that Gene and JB have been discussing describing to customers for a long time. This data that is in front of you is what we developed from late September into November broken into three groups; the first 10 months that we could compare inspection response time report to the efficiency report, that's the next 12, and below is the last 12 up to August. Your next handout turns this into averages. You take the first 10 months turned into averages that you can compare and the next 12 months after that and the most recent 12 months. What it shows you is that there was a 5% difference between the two reports comparatively. There was about a 9% difference in the average days. When we introduced this report the BDC still wanted to keep the average days for inspection and we did and show that under the IRT which is always in red and the IER is always in blue, the average was 1.06 and under the IER was 1.15. Those numbers are all well within the goal range, to remind you that the goal range is 85% - 90%. I would also point out that the first set of numbers is between RIF 1 and RIF 2. The second set of numbers is post-RIF 2. We had gone down from having 81 inspectors down to 56. This is where you can see the variance between the two reports gets quite a bit bigger. It gets to be 13.8% between the 2 averages and it gets to be a little over .14 days if you think in terms of days per inspection. In the most recent set the difference is 15.14 between these two groups of data and if you talk in terms of days it is about .2 days. What we concluded from that is the difference in the reports is very sensitive to FTE counts. Not surprising but there doesn't seem to be any connection in inspection counts; oddly there doesn't seem to be a connection between permit counts but when you add and subtract employees it really aggravated the spread between these two and the difference between the 2 reports became significant. Part of our research too is to compare the criteria that was used. We dug back into emails that go back to 2006 trying to document what was exactly the programming criteria that was given to Revere and to IST and the to the people that put the Posse report together and that's what this represents. We were surprised, it describes how this was measured and that is that if you call in an inspection at 7:00 a.m. in the morning it starts the clock and if we complete it by 6:59 a.m. the next day we're on time. The IRT report after we dug into it deeply, you can see that if you complete the inspection by 11:59 a.m. the next day you are still on time. So it added in the variation between the 2 reports. We also discovered that if you look at the IER it actually cuts the time off for inspection at 11:59 ignoring the next morning. The difference of the net result if you look at this over the last year it shows the gap. I would emphasize that neither one of these reports are what we are after. What we are after something that probably is slightly above the bottom line. What this shows is the difference between the 2 and the deviation from the goal range, it also shows you something that Gene talked about earlier, that over the last two months we've started to see a dip regardless of which report we use there is a dip and is one of the reasons (not a primary argument) for the betterment, you can see what he was talking about. What we are proposing is that long term we need to replaced both of these reports with a new report. Computronix is going to install a new management dashboard in the spring and with that we'll be able to create a new report that is center criteria focused; be in by 7:00 a.m. complete by 6:59 a.m. the next morning as we consider that on-time in the first 24 hours. The long term goals are to replace these two reports. In the interim we will report both sets of numbers to the BDC on a monthly basis so you can understand the range of performance between the 2 reports although neither report really reflects what our goal is. That is a quick sketch of the problem. We've been using a report that does not accurately reflect the performance in the field but the other report we've got is too conservative. By looking at the range you

can get a sense of where we are and our proposal is long-term to replace the two and report both reports to you on a monthly basis until they are replaced which will be sometime in March or April.

EM: Once you do that it will be from that point forward and won't give us history?

JB: I don't know if we can go back and recreate. Will have to get to the point where we can work with what we've got and see if we can recreate. But probably it will be going forward not recreating.

JM: As that line dips lower and lower we need to hire people in order to maintain our customer service levels but also because we monitor our performance as a department using this criteria and important that we be transparent and we realized there's a mistake that becomes obvious as work ramps up and we have fewer people and that we transparently relay our fix for that so that a) we can adequately and above adequately deliver customer service and also that we can make sure that we are monitoring ourselves properly.

JB: Correct. We post the IRT on a weekly basis for customers to refer to. We started that in the office, it was built on the idea that we were posting our booking lead times for the design community so that they could know how much lead they needed to plan for and I think when we came out of the 2nd RIF we came up with the idea of posting IRTs on a weekly basis as well. The industry depends on them.

JM: Do you need any action from us the BDC; stating our confidence in this report that we understand what caused the variances and the methodology you are using to address it?

JB: As soon as we were able to sort through this and get a good understanding, we've done a lot of work on this since the 3rd week in September so we wanted to be sure you knew we moved on this as quickly as we could and collected a good set of information and based on that information studied it, understood what the cause of it was and I am glad we drilled down as far as we did because had we not done that we would have thought that the 2nd report was accurate and then discovered by drilling further that's not accurate either. We now have a better understanding of what we have to do which is to design a new report and not just switch to the other report. First we want you to understand we brought this to you as quickly as we could and secondly if you work with as much data as us and you're working with programmers and you're working with the English language; sometimes things like this will happen. We just didn't communicate between us how important the difference was between a day clock and a 7:00 clock; somehow Gene and I never picked up that they didn't pick up on it. We finally got to the point when we studied the differences in the reports that's where it came from.

JM: It became obvious with the DNC when you knew the workload had spiked and it wasn't showing up in one report and then the other report you were being penalized. Having heard it from the longer version last Monday and today I understand and realize why, when and how you addressed it.

JM: It's important that the BDC be comfortable they understand what happened with the reports and we have a good strategy to tell you what is going on in the interim as we move forward with a plan to change out the reports.

EM: Is it accurate to say in the time we've been doing this we've been using a consistent methodology, so our deviation up and down has been accurate but represented wrong. We can see the trend lines and may be slightly inaccurate to one side or the other.

JB: It would appear that 1 report is 12 – 15% more optimistic than the second report, although again the 2nd report is inaccurate either and aren't certain where that real bar is and we won't know until we design and run a new report.

JM: Maybe one way to do this is to track a quarter or two through the end of this fiscal year all three measures so if you come up with the third middle rail; that you track the other two with it, for relativity as the viability of that new middle rail.

JB: Once we get the new report going we certain can do that.

JM: I would ask the BDC if there are any questions or concerns; mainly concerns with respect to transparency and how the data is being presented and dealt with.

HS: Gene you expressed that it is requiring more time to do inspections does the ICC have any historical data that says we're seeing it taking 3 more hours to do this in residential just looking at sheer walls, it gets very complicated.

JB: Since I am on the ICC Major Jurisdictions Committee and I can tell you from personal experience of interacting with the other major jurisdictions around the country that there aren't a half dozen authorities that has as much data on this stuff as we do and the short answer is; no. You have the most sophisticated systems of trying to track this stuff and make sense out of as anybody in the country. Other members of the major jurisdictions committee come to us to try and figure out where they are taking their data systems.

HS: ICC really doesn't have a database that says for a \$10MM building it should take about....?

JB: Not to my knowledge; am fairly certain they don't but I can check but am sure the answer is going to be no based on my work on the major jurisdictions and if it existed anywhere; it would be there. They are working hard to build inside that committee a set up of benchmarking data but they just started that in the last year.

HS: How about from the Smart Codes? Being able to take the BIM model?

JB: That's a good question but it's a whole separate issue. Raleigh and Mecklenburg were a very big part of ICC's smart code development program, but when the recession hit in 2008 that was one of the things that was thrown overboard by them in 2009 and 2010. What's happened is it has been picked up by the private sector; by Target, by Viatch and Célèbre and other private sector vendors and they are trying to develop in it and we are participating in that but that will probably come out of the private sector and out of that will come a wealth of information. That's why we are so interested in advancing the BIM pilot with CHC because we think we are going to learn a lot out of that and some of the things that we will learn are not just how to mesh our process with that but also how we can get data out of it that is extremely valuable to us.

HS: Has there ever been anything that says, ok... with the complexity of the code it takes a lot longer to fill out an Appendix B and then with the energy code and everything else going in there, I can't do a lot of things without involvement by other engineers to make this thing work. It seems to me that at some point and time you have to back away from it and say I can't do everything that I intended to do 2 years ago because it just takes longer to actually figure the information out. And certainly, Appendix B helps in giving you an understanding of what somebody was trying to do but at some point in time there is so much stuff now that is required with the code that we run out of time.

JB: We wrestle with that problem in the office all the time. Trying to hit a happy medium.

HS: Is there anybody who is even tracking what that happy medium should be when looking at hand rails or guard rails, but I know it is such a big part of what we are finding incorrect.

JB: You're looking at them.

PG: We talk about those openly; how much can we do.

JB: If your question is, is there another source out there that has a higher level of data and a higher level of overview of what this is taking and what it should be taking, what are the priorities that we should be focusing on. The answer is no, you are probably dealing with one of the largest repositories of that information in the country in what we do and you are probably dealing with people that have more experience in trying to make sense out of this data than anybody else. There are few authorities out there that are into this; Clark County in Las Vegas, NV, Phoenix, AZ, Houston, TX.

BC: That question is progressing to as more complexities come in; are there some things that we can drop off that we are not dropping off; things that are becoming capably handled, things that are not coming up as regular. Your job is not to look at absolutely everything; right? It's not Code Enforcement's purpose to look at absolutely every piece of the building; you can't do that, so are there some things that we had to look at 10 years ago because they were new or they were often incorrect that we don't need to be looking at now because we're looking at other things.

JB: Part of the installation of electronic plan submittal and electronic plan review included something called the plan review matrix; which was a project that spanned over a year (18 mths.) where we retained some retired inspectors as a consultant team to help us review all of that and as you know when EPS was plugged in it does something that nobody else has as well, and that is it gives the plan reviewers a script of things that the intelligent module has decided given the description of the project or what we need to

check at a minimum. Then they use their nose past that. We did a pretty good audit of that when we installed EPS. I think our current concern; Willis, Patrick, Gene and I have been spending some time talking about this is how the energy code impacts that; we'd be very quick to say we don't know yet and are still trying to sort that out but outside of that field I think we've got a good grip on it. Of course, the energy code and the impact of it is significant, the big part is we are not certain.

The handout shows how we might report the difference in the two reports to you on a monthly basis. The way we typically report the data to you from the IRT report; we would give that to you but in the report below; side by side there will be two columns for instance the IRT October average and next to it shows you the IER October average, at the bottom it shows you the difference which is about 17% between the two. What we aren't showing you that we might is the deviation between that and the goal. If it's at 72.1 it's about 13% below the bottom line of the goal; goal being 85-90 that might be something we consider adding. Since you always wanted to keep the inspection response time in days that what we show you. Under the posse reporting system it shows you the average response time in days in the IRT report and next to that is out of the posse system, the IER report that shows you the response time in days and there is a difference there of about .27 days or between 2 and 2.5 hours difference on the average. This is what we thought we'd report to you on a monthly basis. You can look at this and if you have comments for next month's meeting we can flesh it out or do something different.

GM: The other difference is the multi-trade break out. What we've been reporting up until now is single trade BEMP. The new reporting also breaks out multi-trades and gives you a vision of how multi-trade just by them is doing.

7. CSS Focus Group 'A' work report.....Patrick, Gene & JNB

Patrick Granson gave a compressed version of the CSS Focus Group, back in May we gave the BDC a copy of the CSS 2012. One of the ideas the BDC wanted us to do was to assemble a customer service focus group to get another perspective and feedback tool to look at seven primary issues.

- 1) The design of auto-notification and customer awareness of how it works.
- 2) Customer expectations for timely inspections, compared to Dept goals and the IRT report.
- 3) Customer understanding of the plan review and permitting umbrella; what the Department reviews vs. what other agencies review.
- 4) On "reach the right person", suggestions that go beyond the list of steps taken too date.
- 5) Help defining what "clear explanation of changes" means. Is it about process or code req'ts?
- 6) Suggestions on elevating customer awareness of the value of Project Manager (PM) and Code Enforcement Manager (CEM) resources, and new org project centric-problem solving focus.
- 7) Private sector ideas on how to help customers self manage the process (be a process coach), without relieving them of overall responsibility for the P&I outcome.

Out of those seven items, the six things we wanted to look at were:

- a) Timely inspections; study application of TIP to tank less hot water heaters, and minimum permit disciplines required.
- b) Review umbrella; take steps to assure owner reps are involved in design criteria for owner-developer dashboard (see agenda item 8, following).
- c) Reach the right person; looks like customers are being forced into ACD queue, even if they know their contact. Resolve apparent clash between IST recommendation and customer convenience.
- d) Clear explanation of changes – part 1; use articles in professional association periodicals to convey process changes and code interpretations or changes.
- e) Clear explanation of changes – part 2; take steps to assure customers understand the power of "Notify Me" in getting the word out on process changes and code interps/changes.

- f) PM/CEM resource awareness; work with Chamber to elevate customer awareness of PM/CEM value, maybe creating Chamber webpage for Meck, sketching out Code Enforcement as an asset, with key links.

Those were the six focus recommendations, any comments or thoughts that you think we should do? We are moving forward to address these issues.

JM: I just think it's admirable that you poll your customers and you listen to them and then you take action. That's a lot to swallow and you do well on that.

JB: The only other thing I would emphasize is that we think that the 7th topic that talks about private sector ideas on how to help customers to self manage the process; we think that's one that we've tried to initiate a dialogue with Natalie on who might be part of that discussion; we made overtures to UNCC; that one is going to take some work. We won't lose track of this but it's more of a long term topic we can work on.

8. Developer Dashboard

Geri Walton talked about the developer dashboard saying that last year in December you talked about bringing the developers dashboard onboard as part of our technology platform. It came about when Patrick and JNB had been in customer meetings focusing on owner's access to project information, and that it would be helpful to the developers/owners in monitoring project status. We suggested that owner-developers would benefit from a web screen designed to give them ready access to project monitoring info as they need, without having to navigate the entire site. In March, the BDC Budget Subcommittee and the full BDC approved the FY13 budget, which included technology funds to develop an "owner-developer" dashboard. The basic premise of this new module is that owner-developers are more like homeowners, than GC's or AE's, in that they are in meckpermit.com infrequently; so they don't have favorites page tabbed, and the site isn't like "riding a bicycle". We are now ready to start moving forward with this project, but participants in the October 19 CSS focus group meeting (see item 7) were crystal clear that this needs a lot of user input on screen content and design. Geri passed out her business card asked that members contact her with any suggestions of some associations that we can tap into to get people to help develop this and make it exactly what the users' need. She asked for this information by the end of the month.

JM: I think you need to contact Natalie at the Chamber, Joe at REBIC,

JB: I mentioned this in a presentation I made at the REBIC developer forum, I told them we needed volunteers but we wanted to make you aware of it. If you know someone that might be a good candidate on the owner/developer side that can plug into this; get us the name to JB or GW. Will talk to Natalie and Joe about this.

JM: The 3rd wheel on that is Teresa Salmon, NAOP; she's good at obtaining volunteers.

9. Department Statistics and Initiatives Report

Statistics Report

Permit Revenue

- October permit (only) revenue- \$1,642,006, compares to September revenue of \$1,200,325.
 - Fy13 budget projected monthly permit revenue; $\$13,752,568/12 = \$1,143,798$
 - So October permit revenue is \$498,208 above monthly projection
- At 10/31/12, YTD permit rev of \$5,695,981 is above permit fee rev projection by \$1.1208M or 24.5%

Construction Value of Permits Issued

- October total - \$267,754,248, compared to September total of \$156,133,020
- YTD at Oct 31 of \$897,283,878; this is <1% above constr value permit'd YTD at 10/31/11 (\$890.4M)

Permits Issued:

	Sept	October	3 Month Trend
Residential	2994	3862	4170/3659/2994/3862
Commercial	2181	2734	2314/3134/2181/2734
Other (Fire/Zone)	469	490	455/480/469/490
Total	5644	7086	6939/7273/5644/7086

- Residential up 29%; commercial up 25.3%; total up 25.5%
- Note; at Oct 31, SF detached permits YTD totaled 1026, compared to 778 at same time in Fy12 (up 32%)

Inspection Activity: Inspections Performed

Insp. Req.	Sept	Oct	Insp. Perf.	Sept	Oct	% Change
Bldg.	4509	5458	Bldg.	4444	5414	+21.8%
Elec.	5751	6598	Elec.	5757	6577	+14.2%
Mech.	3121	3793	Mech.	3069	3702	+20.6%
Plbg.	2408	2892	Plbg.	2373	2855	+20.3%
Total	15,789	18,741	Total	15,643	18,548	+18.5%

- Insp. performed totals up 18.5%; ranging from 14% to 22% -
- Insp. performed were 98.97% of inspections requested_

Inspection Activity: Inspections Response Time (IRT Report)

Insp. Resp. Time	OnTime %		Total % After 24 Hrs. Late		Total % After 48 Hrs. Late		Average Resp. in Days	
	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct	Sept	Oct
Bldg.	93.4	88.2	94.7	91.1	97.4	96.7	1.16	1.25
Elec.	96.1	90.4	96.5	92.0	98.5	98.5	1.09	1.19
Mech.	95.7	83.1	96.2	86.9	98.8	94.8	1.10	1.38
Plbg.	96.7	94.8	96.8	95.2	99.4	99.4	1.07	1.11
Total	95.4	89.0	96.0	91.2	98.4	97.4	1.11	1.24

- Overall down 5.4%; all trades down 2-12%, with plbg least (2%-) and mech most (12.6%)

IRT Comparison to POSSE Inspection Efficiency Report (IER)

1 st - 24 hr average	IRT Oct rate	IER Oct rate	% difference	insp resp in days	IRT Oct av'g	IER Oct av'g	difference in days
Bldg.	88.2%	70.2%	-18.0%	Bldg.	1.25	1.57	-.32
Elec.	90.4%	65.0%	-25.4%	Elec.	1.19	1.48	-.29
Mech.	83.1%	46.9%	-36.2%	Mech.	1.38	1.73	-.35
Plbg	94.8%	80.0%	-14.8%	Plbg.	1.11	1.27	-.16
MT.	na	72.1%	na	MT.	na	na	na
Total	89.0%	72.1%	-16.9%	Total	1.24	1.51	-.27

- So there appears to be variance between IRT & IER as follows;
 - IER is 16.8% lower on percent complete in 1st 24 hours.
 - IER av'g days per inspection is .27days longer.
- Have handout sample of how we might report the variance between reports to the BDC in future.
 - Does this work for BDC members?

Inspection Pass Rates for October, 2012:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 84.75%, compared to 84.16%, in September

Bldg: September – 76.13% **Elec:** September – 83.82%
October – 78.11% October – 84.06%

Mech: September – 86.73% **Plbg:** September – 92.92%
October – 87.49% October – 92.02%

- Bldg, Elec and Mech all improved, ranging .25% to 2%; Plbg down <1%
- Overall average up .6%, and still well above 75-80% goal range

OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for October, 2012

CTAC:

- 149 first reviews, compared to 151 in September.
 - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 71%
 - CTAC was 48% of OnSch (*) first review volume ($149/149+156 = 305$) = 48.8%
- *CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

OnSchedule:

- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only
- October, 11: 176- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11: 184 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11: 143 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012: 136 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12: 139 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12: 127 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12: 151 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12: 195 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only
- June, 12: 235 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.63% all trades, 98.25% B/E/M/P only
- July, 12: 166 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94.88% all trades, 97.5% B/E/M/P only
- August, 12: 199 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89.5% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- September, 12: 118 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 96.38% all trades, 97.25% B/E/M/P only
- October, 12: 183 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 97% all trades, 98.75% B/E/M/P only

Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on October 29, 2012, showed
 - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-4 work days booking lead
 - 3-4 hr projects; at 2-5 work days lead, but Bldg -7, MP – 18, & Health at 18 days.
 - 5-8 hr projects; at 3-5 work days lead, but Bldg -11, M/P – 18, & Health at 18 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; EMP at 2-3 work days, except bldg at 8 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 8 work days for small projects, 8 work days for large

Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

October Meeting Follow-up

BDC Quarterly Bulletin

- Draft completed on October 25, comments received from BDC Chair. Department posted and e-mailed the Bulletin on November 16.

Racking Permit Issue

- Patrick G and OnSch management team will hold two lunch & learn sessions on Dec 5 at 11:30 and 1:30.

Updates on Other Department Work

CSS Report Follow-up Work

- See item 7 in this report

Auto-Notification Reconvene of CCTF

- See item 4 in this report

Update on Builder Concerns on Temporary Electrical Process

Jeff Griffin updated the BDC on the Temporary Electrical Process; we've got our temporary bridge in place and remain so until final automation of the process has been completed. The programmer has started work on this process and best estimate for completion is sometime in January, so we would like to pull that off the agenda until it's ready; come back to the BDC in January or February and give you a presentation.

Roofing Contractor Awareness of Permit Requirements and Related Mechanical Work

Willis Horton shared that he has been in contact with CMUD and Piedmont Natural Gas for about 3 months getting results and do have information now; Piedmont Natural Gas now has this information online as of October 30th. There is a hyperlink that has been added and going out over 3 states not just Mecklenburg. They did use Mecklenburg County's example in their information. Also, I emailed Carla Simms, Executive Director for Carolina Roofing and Sheet Metal Association to get this out to their membership. CMUD's Cam Corey went thru the legal department and stated their fee of \$3000 for flyers to go out. Willis asked for the BDC's thoughts about spending the \$3000. We've got the word out. Tim Taylor is giving out flyers to everyone that comes in, so I really think we've got the word out.

JB: I don't think it makes sense to spend \$3000 since he has gotten mileage out of what he has done so far. I think we've been diligent about following-up on your concern and got the word out there so if it's ok with you, I think we close the door on this w/out spending the money.

JM: I agree.

RDS Plan Review Status at 11/19/2012

- Turnaround times as of 11/19/2012; paper plans at 3 days, E-plans at 6 days, townhomes at 3 days.
- Unless the BDC objects, this seems well under control and we propose dropping this special topic.

Manager/CA Added Comments

Chuck Walker updated the BDC on PENC has traditionally provided a day long educational seminar here in Charlotte. This year it was October 30th at UNCC. One of the 1.5 hr. presentations was reinvesting existing buildings. Two of our plans examiners, Vikki Stokes and Howard Grindstaff were part of this with a power point program showing the history of the REHAB Code. And if you will remember Mecklenburg County Code Enforcement was one of the pilot counties before it became a statewide code. Then there was a design team that talked about the existing 7 story office building/parking deck that was converted from medical use into the Sonic Automotive Headquarters beside Cotswald Shopping Center; some of their design challenges, things they found in the building they didn't know.... A very good program, well received as far as how the code helped this company quickly get into new corporate headquarters when there wasn't time to go purchase land and build a new building. It went over very well and PENC is very thankful of the support from our group.

Joe Weathers announced that John West, Plans Examiner has been installed as the new president of the NC Ellis Cannidy Chapter International Association of Electrical Inspectors.

10. Adjournment

The November 20th, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned 5:06 p.m.

The next BDC meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 18th, 2012.